

MEETING MINUTES FROM THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

July 2, 2003

Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

AGENCY MEMBERS

* David Fern, Chandler	Keith Kesti, Peoria
Mark Weiner, Gilbert	Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
* Pat Thurman, Glendale	*Troy Hayes, Phoenix (Water)
* David Ramirez, Goodyear	Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Ted Collins, MCDOT	*Brett Huskey, Surprise
* Steven Borst, MCESD	*James Bond, Tempe
Doug Davis, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Brian Gallimore, AGC	*Tom Domizi, NUCA
* Jim Grose, AGC	Peter Kandaris, SRP
Paul Nebeker, NUCA	*Sean Goris, ACEA
Jeff Benedict, ARPA	John Ashley, ACA
* Baird Fullerton, ACEC	Don Green, ARPA

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Joe Phillips, Maricopa County Dept. of Trans.	Stew Waller, Rinker Materials
Dale Phelan, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.	Nolan Schabacker, Grabber Power Products
Mark Kastl, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.	Bill Naugle, On-Direct
Kenneth R. Cooper, ADOT	

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:45 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the minutes from the meeting of June 4, 2003. Mark Weiner noted that his name was misspelled in the third sentence of Item 2. Ted Collins introduced a motion for a vote on the minutes with the one exception. Mark Weiner seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. Presentation on ADA Requirements:

Kenneth Cooper of ADOT provided a short overview of ADOT's position on the adoption of the standards for truncated domes. They are presently in the testing and evaluation program, searching for the best type of dome available. They are using three factors in the evaluation process: 1) Constructability, 2) User Acceptability and, 3) Durability. They would like to have a minimum of 10 years of durability. They are only evaluating new construction and not retrofitting of existing facilities. The various types reviewed are glue down, cast-in-place, pavers, tiles, etc. Some of the short comings with the various systems are expansion and contraction, pop-outs, etc. ADOT is not rushing into this process. They are deliberately taking a very cautious approach. They do not want to select a product or method only to discover in a few years that it is not a good product and will need to be replaced. As long as the various government agencies have a policy and are moving in a steady positive direction on developing the domes, Ken believes that FHWA will not force any action. John Ashley believes that the Access Board has not completely resolved all of the issues regarding the domes. Once resolved, then the agencies can proceed in a more positive direction. He noted that the Board has contracted with the University of Buffalo to provide additional research on the subject. Since the Board meeting last October, the next step will be the development of the draft rules/guidelines, followed by additional input and then a final rules/guidelines. This process will take a number of months.

4. 2002 Carry Over Cases:

- a. **Case 02-03 - Corrections for Asphalt Concrete Deficiencies:** Joe asked for any final comments that the members may have. He will be assembling the final draft for a vote. ARPA presented the first draft of their modifications on Section 321 and 710 to Mesa for their review and comments. They will provide a copy to Joe. Due to the extent of the changes and the late date, the Committee will not take any action on ARPA modifications.
- b. **Case 02-04 - Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete:** Joe asked for any final comments that members may have on the case. Joe will assemble the final draft for a vote.
- c. **Case 02-14 - Section 738.5 - Third Party Certification for HDPE:** Rod Ramos handed out the latest revision to this case (dated June 4, 2003). The revision is the same as provided in the last meeting (no changes). Rod requested that any final comments on this case be submitted to him prior to the next meeting.
- d. **Case 02-15 & 17 - Sections 603.2 and 601.1 - Trench Width:** Rod Ramos handed out the latest revision to this case (July 2, 2003). Two items were changed since the last

meeting. First, the note for table 601-1 has been rewritten. Second, the last sentence in Section 603.2 was restored. The sentence was inadvertently deleted in an earlier revision.

- e. **Case 02-16 - Section 603.5.5 - Affidavit of Installation:** Rod Ramos handed out the latest revision to this case (July 2, 2003). The changes from the previous version were the deletion of the last sentence in the first paragraph and some word changes in the first sentence of the second paragraph. The changes were made to help clarify that each certification is a stand alone option and that they are not mandatory for each project. Also, since the subject matter of the case did not relate to the other subsections in 601.2, the case was given its own subsection number within 601.2.
- f. **Case 02-18 - Section Bedding by Water Consolidation:** Rod Ramos handed out the latest revision to this case (June 16, 2003). The most recent change was to clarify the status of the fourth sentence on the first paragraph. The sentence was intended to be deleted and should have been shown in the paragraph with a line drawn through the text. Dale Phelan of ADS indicated that a deeper lift could be acceptable for this pipe if the contractor can demonstrate that compaction can be achieved. This was in response to the notes from last months meeting regarding the manufacturers acceptance of lifts greater than 8 inches.
- g. **Case 02-20 - Section 601.2.2.1 Center Clearance of Multiple Pipes:** Rod Ramos handed out the latest revision to this case (July 2, 2003). The only change was the location in Section 601.2 the paragraph will be placed.

5 2003 Cases

- a. **Case 03-01A - Miscellaneous Corrections:** There was no discussion on this case.
- b. **Case 03-03 - Details 252, 253 and 254 - Bus Bays:** Ted submitted a new revised detail for this case. The detail was in the monthly packet. After re-looking at all of the various bus bays and trying to come to a consensus, MCDOT elected to modify the existing detail. The revised case reflects the modifications. The current detail has two sets of notes in the detail and MCDOT is adding more notes. Doug suggested combining all of the notes in one set (MCDOT Notes, Bus Bay Notes, Parking Bay Notes). He provided a suggested combined set for Ted to consider. John suggested Ted consider changing the slab thickness to 9 inches and the concrete strength to class AA. Based on the current weight of buses, the extra inch and strength may be required. Also, there are several locations where the concrete slab comes to a point. This will cause the slab to crack at the point. It was recommended to use the method shown in Scottsdale's detail to resolve the problem.
- c. **Case 03-04 - Section 718 - Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete:** David Fern was not in attendance however, the Committee discussed the case. Doug's interpretation of the case was the deletion of Gilsonite and general polymers and the addition of only acrylic polymers. This is not the updating of the Section as stated in the earlier meeting. Doug felt that the general polymers should stay and if enough of the agencies use the

acrylic polymers, than the acrylic polymers could be placed in the Specification as Type E. In a poll of the members, only Chandler and Mesa use the acrylic polymers. Jeff and John felt that Table 718-1 should be incorporated in the emulsified asphalt table and Section 718 with modifications will make reference to the emulsified table. Doug requested that John and Jeff contact David and discussed this approach to the case as discussed in the meeting. Also, Jeff felt that additional test data should be added to Type A and Type B.

6. New Cases:

- a. **03-01 C - Detail 420-1 - Pre-Cast Concrete Sewer Manhole:** Mark submitted a miscellaneous case to the Committee for their review and comments. Mark requested that the note “**RAM NEK PLASTIC GASKET OR EQUAL**” be added to the first page of the detail. Since Detail 420 was split into two pages, the detail is creating confusion with some contractors when to use the product because the Ram Nék note was not shown on both sheets of the detail.

7. General Discussion:

- a. There was no General Discussion in this meeting.

8. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:26 p.m.